



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,411	09/23/2003	Lien-Hong Chen	0941-0842P	1085
2292 7590 05/29/2009 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER MISIASZEK, MICHAEL				
ART UNIT 3625		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 05/29/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/667,411

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Misiaszek

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the first electronic group" in lines 19-20. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 2-6 are rejected at least for their dependence on claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4-6, 7, 8, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin et al. (US 6549906 B1, hereinafter Austin) in view of Lopez et al. (US 7149709 B1, hereinafter Lopez).

Regarding Claims 1, 7, 8

Austin discloses a method and system of order reexamination in an EDI (electronic data interchange), comprising:

- an EDI server to receive an EDI message; (at least abstract: computer)
- a message conversion system coupled to the EDI server to receive the EDI message for conversion to a first electronic order (at least column 8, line 30-column 9, line10)
- an order management system coupled to the message conversion system to receive the first electronic order; (At least figure 2: expansion module, approval agent)
- an order reexamination system coupled to the EDI server and the order management system to receive the EDI message and the first electronic order, the order reexamination system comprising: an order conversion unit to parse

the EDI message to generate a second electronic order (at least column 8, line 30-column 9, line 10)

- a job scheduling module to compare the first electronic order group and the second electronic order, and generate a notification if the order IDs in the first electronic order group do not match the second electronic order group or the quantity of the orders in the first electronic order group is different from that of the second electronic order group (at least column 9, lines 27-52: error checking compares expanded data to user-entered data; includes checking for quantity discrepancies)

Austin does not explicitly disclose order groups comprising a plurality of orders, each having a unique order ID. Lopez teaches that it is known to include processing order groups comprising a plurality of orders, each have a unique ID (at least column 9, lines 13-34) in a similar environment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and system, as taught by Austin, with the order groups, as taught by Lopez, since such a modification would have only united elements of the prior art, with no change in their respective functions, and which yield predictable results.

Regarding Claims 4, 6, 11, 13

Austin discloses:

- wherein the order conversion unit parses the EDI message according to a standard EDI format, thereby generating the second electronic order (at least column 1, lines 34-50)
- wherein the job scheduling module further sends a signal to suspend the order management system if the order IDs in the first electronic order group do not match the second electronic order group or the quantity of the orders in the first electronic order group is different from that of the second electronic order group (at least column 9, lines 27-52: error checking sends a message that suspends order management if discrepancies are found between entered data and converted data)

Regarding Claims 5, 12

While Austin does not specifically disclose a GENTRAN server, it does disclose a message conversion server, as detailed above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Austin to have included any specific type of message conversion server because such would have been an obvious matter of design choice in light of the method and system already disclosed by Austin. Such modification would not have otherwise affected the method and system of Austin and would have merely represented one of numerous steps that the skilled artisan would have found obvious for the purposes already disclosed by Austin. Additionally, applicant has not persuasively demonstrated the criticality of the specific types of message conversion server set forth by the claimed invention versus the message conversion server which Austin discloses.

3. Claims 2-3 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin in view of Lopez as applied above, and further in view of Chan (US 20030115499 A1).

Regarding Claims 2, 9

Austin and Lopez disclose the claimed invention except for:

- wherein the job scheduling module compares the first electronic order group and the second electronic order group within a preset time interval

Chan teaches that it is known to include reviewing EDI message within a preset time interval (at least paragraph 26) in a similar environment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and system, as taught by Austin and Lopez, with the reviewing within a preset time, as taught by Chan, since such a modification would have only united elements of the prior art, with no change in their respective functions, and which yield predictable results.

Regarding Claims 3, 10

Austin discloses:

- wherein the job scheduling module further generates another notification if the first electronic order group is not received from the order management system (at least column 9, lines 27-52: error checking module sends notification for incomplete/un-received orders)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Misiaszek whose telephone number is (571)272-6961. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 5:30 PM, Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith can be reached on (571) 272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey A. Smith/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3625

Michael A. Misiaszek
Patent Examiner
5/25/2009